

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On August 12, 2008, the Examiner and the undersigned conducted an interview during which the claims and the cited art of record were generally discussed. In particular, the Applicants asked for clarification on the Examiner's rejection in the previous Office Action. The Examiner indicated that a different reference was cited because it was supposedly clearer than the reference that was relied upon in the Final Office Action. No agreement was reached.

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Decision of the Panel to reopen prosecution on the merits of Applicants' arguments Presented in the Appeal Brief filed March 10, 2007. Applicants acknowledge that prosecution has been reopened and a non-final office action has been issued, presenting new grounds of rejection. Applicants choose to exercise the option of filing a reply under 37 C.F.R. 1.111.

Claims 1, 11 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Zhang*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 5, 6, 9 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zhang* in view of *Bridgelall* (US Patent Pub. No. 2002/0085516). Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Zhang* in view of *Waylett* (US Patent Pub. No. 2005/0088999). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for reasons more fully disclosed below.

Claim 1, directed to a method, calls, in part, for determining a private key for a first network based on at least one security value associated with a second network. The Examiner argues that the "session key" disclosed in *Zhang* corresponds to "private key" of claim 1, and the "3G network" corresponds to the "second network." The "session key" in *Zhang*, however, is not determined based on a security value associated with the 3G network ("second network," according to the Examiner). Rather, *Zhang* describes that the "session key" is created by the

WLAN server (not the 3G network), where the WLAN server then transmits the key to the user device to establish a communications session. *See Zhang*, ¶24 (describing that WLAN creates a session key and encrypts the session key using the public key of the user device before transmitting it to the user device). Thus, contrary to the Examiner's suggestion, the "session key" in *Zhang* is not based on a "security value" associated with the 3G network.

Zhang does describe that the 3G network and the WLAN network have a pre-existing trust relationship. *See Zhang*, ¶25. However, Zhang makes clear in ¶24 that the "session key" (which the Examiner calls the "private key") is determined by the WLAN server using the user device's public key, and is not determined based on any "security value" associated with the 3G network.

Additionally, the "session key" in *Zhang* is not a "private key," as called for in claim 1. Claim 1 calls for determining a private key for a first network based on at least one security value associated with a second network, wherein the private key refers to a key that, once calculated, is not shared with another device, and the specification confirms this. *See Patent Application*, p.18, lines 10-12. Unlike the "private key" of claim 1, the "session key" of *Zhang* describes that the "session key" is created by the WLAN server and then transmitted to the user device to establish a session. *See Zhang*, ¶24. Because the "session key" in *Zhang* is shared with another device after it is determined (in this case with the user device), the "session key" is not a "private key" as that term is used in the claims and the specification.

In view of at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Additionally, the other independent claims (11 & 20) and their respective dependent claims are also allowable for the same reasons.

With respect to certain dependent claims, the Office Action is traversed for at least the further reasons presented below. Claim 2 calls for determining the private key based on a shared secret data key (SSD key) associated with the cellular network. With respect to this feature, the Examiner argues that *Zhang* discloses, in ¶24, determining a session key based on a shared secret data key associated with the 3G network (“cellular network,” according to the Examiner). Applicants respectfully disagree. As previously established with respect to claim 1, a session key as used in *Zhang* is not a private key, as called for in claim 1. Further, even assuming for the sake of argument that the two key types may be compared as the Examiner asserts, ¶24 of *Zhang* teaches that it is the WLAN server 230 and not the 3G network that determines the session key. Notably, *Zhang* further describes that the session key that is generated by the WLAN server 230 is *then* transmitted by the WLAN to a user device through the 3G network. *See Zhang*, ¶24. Thus, notwithstanding the Examiner’s assertion to the contrary, *Zhang* simply does not disclose or suggest determining the session key based on any shared secret data key associated with the 3G network. In fact, *Zhang* is completely silent with respect to shared secret data keys (SSD keys) and determining private keys based on security values associated with a second network. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable. For substantially the same reasons, it is submitted that claim 12 is also allowable.

Claim 4 calls for populating the private key with a cryptographic transform of the shared secret data key. The Examiner alleges this feature is taught in paragraph 24 of *Zhang*. The cited paragraph describes encrypting a session key using a public key of the user device. It does not, however, describe a cryptographic transform, and certainly does not describe populating the private key with such a transform of the shared secret data key, as called for by claim 4. For at

least this reason, it is submitted that claim 4 is allowable. For substantially the same reasons, it is submitted that claim 13 is allowable.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application and this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 14, 2008

/Ruben S. Bains/
Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS